# CITY OF REDMOND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review

in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Lara Sirois, Joe Palmquist, Jannine McDonald

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Gary Lee, Senior Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp, Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

## **CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:03 p.m.

#### <u>MINUTES</u>

MOTION BY MR. PALMQUIST, AND SECONDED BY MS. SIROIS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2011 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

#### PRE-APPLICATION

## PRE110006, Redmond Square Apartments

Description: Two five-story apartment buildings with two levels of parking; total 202,100 square feet

Location: 7941 170<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** Oscar DelMoro *with* Cosmos Development Company **Architect:** Robin Murphy *with* Stricker Cato Murphy Architects

Prior Review Date: 03/03/11, 04/07/11 & 05/0511

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418, glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee noted that this was the fourth pre-application meeting for this project. He noted that this project was very close to approval at the last meeting, but there were a few comments made by the DRB for improvement. Mr. Lee has identified three issues that still need to be resolved:

- 1. The pedestrian-oriented space, or muse, in the alley, was proposed to be set off with bollards. The Technical Committee has informed staff that bollards cannot be used. Therefore, that area cannot be counted as common open space.
- 2. The north elevation looks better than before, but Mr. Lee is asking if the DRB would like to see the porch areas a little bigger, or other improvements.
- 3. The garage openings and the lighting around them need improvement. Mr. Lee suggests that louvers should be used in these areas to shield the lighting, or perhaps some other directional lighting.

Craig Schilling spoke on behalf of the applicant, Mr. DelMoro. He thanked the DRB for the constructive criticism given thus far, and is asking for the Board's blessing to move into the formal permit process. Architect Robin Murphy spoke next on behalf of the applicant. He says all of the DRB's comments, for the most part, have been incorporated in the improvements presented. The applicant has improved the rotunda at the southeast corner and the residential lobby according to the Board's critiques. On the north façade of Building A, another column of windows has been added to create a less awkward design. The applicant attempted to add more decks to some of the north facing units, as suggested by Mr. Lee, but the design simply did not work out for the three-bedroom units, in particular. Regarding the lighting, the applicant has heard the recommendation about louvered lights, but would like lights with shielding for better security.

Redmond Design Review Board Minutes May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Page 2

On the rotunda, the applicant has incorporated the design concept of the windows from the building, as suggested by the DRB at the last meeting. Black and copper metals, as well as bricks, will be been used. The lobby area now includes windows with wood trim to present a more residential scale. The brick detail has now been stretched around the entirety of the building. All the units facing the courtyard are bracketed by decks that go up against that brick shoulder. The entries are recessed, allowing protection from the elements without awnings. In the vacated alley, there was a plan for some sport courts to make it a dynamic, pedestrian-oriented space, but without the bollards, that could present a challenge regarding common open space. The applicant noted that some step lights have been added at street level to provide more illumination.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

## Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the north entry, and what he saw as a reveal in the brick design. The applicant says
  there is a seamless façade of brick; what Mr. Palmquist is seeing is a software glitch. The expansion
  joints would be right by the windows.
- Mr. Palmquist suggested a reveal around those windows to create a better entry design. He asked about the height of the sill in the garage compared to the garage floor.
- The applicant says the podium is nine feet above the parking level, so the sill is five feet above parking level one, with a window about eight inches higher than that. Mr. Lee expressed some concerns that light spilling from the garage would be unattractive.
- The applicant noted that some metal mesh and some landscaping would block some of that lighting. Mr. Palmquist said that asking for louvers would increase costs on the project significantly. A welded metal mesh would be used, according to the applicant.

### Ms. Sirois:

- Asked if a finer metal mesh or screen could be used to shield more light. The applicant noted that such an idea was possible. Ventilation of the garage is not an issue; it is not an open garage.
   Mechanical ventilation will be in the ceiling, in this design.
- Mr. Palmquist noted that denser materials around the openings surrounding the lights, or Ms. Sirois' idea for a finer mesh, would be good solutions. Offsetting the mesh could potentially help, as well. He noted that there might be solutions other than louvers. Glowing light rather than direct light and glare would be acceptable, in Mr. Palmquist's opinion.

### Ms. McDonald:

- Expressed concerns about the evenness of the lighting in the garage, and where the light fixtures might be located.
- The applicant says the ceiling in the garage is flat, which should not present a lighting challenge.
- Mr. Palmquist says the applicant resolved the tower issue well. The applicant noted that on the tower, the parapet was raised, and the location and size of the doors on the balconies has been changed.
- Ms. Sirois says a lot of the concerns of the DRB have been answered with the revisions made by the applicant. She says the changes of the tower have made a big difference. She likes the more residential entry to the building, as well.
- Ms. McDonald likes the north elevation, and says it fits in well with the character of the building while adding some interest in a thoughtful way.
- She also likes the more simplified inner courtyard and the front entry, with the wood windows. She says the project has come a long way.
- Ms. McDonald asked about street trees on the north side. Mr. Lee noted that there are no trees here, nor any grass, as some storm drains were recently installed. The applicant showed the DRB some additional landscaping, including trees in planters, intended to minimize that lack of greenery.
- Ms. McDonald says that landscaping effort should help break up the view of that façade; she was pleased with that solution and the project overall.

### Mr. Meade:

 Agreed with the concept of trees flanking the entry. Mr. Meade also echoed Mr. Palmquist's solution for vertical reveal lines in the brick in the north façade, which he says would mimic what has been done on the upper two stories. Redmond Design Review Board Minutes May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Page 3

- Mr. Meade says there is a legitimate concern about glowing lighting in the garage, and the applicant needs to resolve that issue with staff to control that glare.
- Mr. Meade noted that losing the outdoor space in the muse area is unfortunate, but he believes this space will still be functional and still get used.
- Mr. Meade likes the changes made to the tower and the new entry, which help the project fit into the neighborhood better.
- Mr. Lee noted that this project was still in pre-application status. Mr. Meade, along with the rest of the Board, concurred that this project was at a level of completeness that all the members were comfortable with. He would like the project to come back for approval soon with the comments made at this meeting kept in consideration.

# **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION MADE BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MS. MCDONALD TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:35 P.M. MOTION PASSES (4-0).	
MINUTES APPROVED ON	RECORDING SECRETARY